## REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed November 14, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-21 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087503 (Judd) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,832,450 (Myers), U.S. Patent No. 6,192,112 (Rapaport) and Official Notice. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, and 18-21 are patentable over Judd, Myers, Rapaport and Official Notice for at least the following reasons.

As correctly noted on page 3 of the Final Office Action, Judd does not disclose or suggest "a computer coupled to the information acquisition device, the computer including logic for receiving information from the information acquisition device, for setting a reconsider flag to indicate that new information is available for

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action of November 14, 2007

informing a user of arrival of the new information associated to a study to which the new information corresponds if the study has been reviewed, and for not setting the reconsider flag if the study is unread has not been reviewed even when the new information is available, for notifying the user if the user is currently reviewing the study, and for not notifying the user if the user is not currently reviewing the study," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 7 and 13.

Official Notice related to Microsoft Outlook<sup>™</sup> is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Judd. Applicants strongly disagree and request that the Examiner provide prior art references or particular documents related to Microsoft Outlook<sup>™</sup> clearly illustrating that it is well known to provide or not provide notifications as recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 13. While Microsoft Outlook<sup>™</sup> may disclose flagging or conditional flags, it is respectfully submitted that Microsoft Outlook<sup>™</sup> alone or combined with Judd does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 7 and 13 which, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action of November 14, 2007

for <u>setting</u> a reconsider <u>flag</u> to indicate that new information is available for informing a user of arrival of the new information associated to a study to which the new information corresponds <u>if the study has been reviewed</u>, and for <u>not setting</u> the reconsider <u>flag</u> <u>if the study has not been reviewed even when the new information is available</u>, <u>for notifying</u> the user <u>if the user is currently reviewing</u> the study, and for <u>not notifying</u> the user <u>if the user is not currently reviewing</u> the study.

Rapaport and Myers are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Judd and Official Notice.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 7 and 13 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4, 6, 8-10, 12, 14-16 and 18-21 should also be allowed based at least on their dependence from independent claims 1, 7 and 13.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position,

PATENT

Serial No. 09/876,690

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action of November 14, 2007

should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded. And in particular, no Official Notices are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703

Attorney for Applicant(s)

December 20, 2007

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP

Applied Technology Center

111 West Main Street

Bay Shore, NY 11706

Tel: (631) 665-5139

Fax: (631) 665-5101